UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

|  | APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE                              | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|---|--|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|  | 10/518,497 12/20/2004                                   |  | Jun Kotani           | 35355/47            | 5517             |
|  | 23838<br>KENYON & K                                     | 7590 05/17/200 <sup>-</sup><br>ENYON LLP |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
|  | 1500 K STREET N.W.<br>SUITE 700<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | T N.W.                                   |                      | MOORE, MARGARET G   |                  |
|  |   |  | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
|  |   |  | 1712                 |                     |                  |
|  |   |  |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  | •   |  |                      |                     |                  |
|  |   |  | ,                    | 05/17/2007          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |
|-------------------|---------------|--|--|
| 10/518,497        | KOTANI ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner          | Art Unit      |  |  |
| Margaret G. Moore | 1712          |  |  |

| ·  | Margaret G. Moore  | 1/12  |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ears on the cover sheet with the   | correspondence add  | ress                                       |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>07 May 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP   | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A  | LLOWANCE.   |  |
| <ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date.</li> </ol>                       | wing replies: (1) an amendment, at<br>otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in<br>ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m                  | fidavit, or other evider<br>compliance with 37 C            | nce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)             |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7   | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH 106.07(f).      | ng date of the final rejecti<br>E FIRST REPLY WAS F         | on.<br>ILED WITHIN                         |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | ctension and the corresponding amount<br>shortened statutory period for reply orion<br>to than three months after the mailing do | of the fee. The appropr                                     | iate extension fee<br>ce action: or (2) as |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>   | ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t  | o avoid dismissal of th                                     | ns of the date of<br>se appeal. Since      |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a   | onsideration and/or search (see NC<br>ow);<br>otter form for appeal by materially re<br>corresponding number of finally re       | TE below); educing or simplifying                           |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s  6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).  | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Control of the rejection under 102.   |   | ,  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 to 6, 9 to 12, 14 to 18, 20 to 22</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:                               | ☐ will not be entered, or b) ⊠ wvided below or appended.   | ill be entered and an e                                     | explanation of                             |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good arwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).   | ut before or on the date of filing a N<br>nd sufficient reasons why the affida   | lotice of Appeal will <u>no</u><br>vit or other evidence is | ot be entered<br>s necessary and           |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar   | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper<br>ry and was not earlier presented. S  | eal and/or appellant fa<br>See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(             | ils to provide a<br>1).                    |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | on of the status of the claims after e   | entry is below or attacl                                    | ned.                                       |
| 11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered by   | ut does NOT place the application  | in condition for allowa                                     | nce because:                               |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.   | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).   | My L  | Jh-  |
|  |  | maigaige O. Moore   | •  |

Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1712

Continuation of 13. Other: The amendment inserts the limitation of previous claim 19 into the independent claims. The Examienr has previously held claim 19 to be obvious due to the fact that the prior art fails to specifically teach an amount of anti-sagging agent. Applicants traverse the obviousness of this amount. While the Examiner did not draw attention to this earlier, please see Example 6 which adds an antisagging agent in an amount of 2 parts per 100 parts of combined silylated polymer (i.e. the total of base polymer). Since this provides the only example of an amount of antisagging agent, the skilled artisan would have been motivated to use this amount of antisagging agent in the compositions of Fujita et al., at least as an initial amount of antisagging agent added. From this the skilled artisan would have been motivated with a reasonable expectation of success to add an antisagging agent in an amount of 2 parts per 100 parts of total base polymer in other compositions of Fujita et al. in an effort to obtain the antisagging properties associated therewith. The vinyl polymer can be present in an amount of 100:1, providing about 99 parts by weight of vinyl polymer for the total base polymer. Adding 2 parts of antisagging agent to such a composition would have been obvious, based on the totality of that taught in Fujita et al. In such a manner the claimed amount of metal soap would have been obvious. The Examiner notes that patentees need not use a compound for the same reason as applicants for a claim to be rendered obvious.